


39-586
~~



PETITION NO. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1989

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

LORRAINE MALINAK,
PETITIONER,

v.


EUGENE J. MATELICH,
RESPONDENT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PETITIONER:

LORRAINE MALINAK
(PETITIONER IN PROPER PERSON)
3800 S. DECATUR BLVD., SP. 62
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89103
TELEPHONE: (702) 362-0164

868



ISSUES PRESENTED

Whether negotiation under seal and delivery of negotiable stocks and bonds in the amount of approximately \$115,000.00 [pursuant to provisions of Articles 2 and 9 (N.R.S. Chapter 1.030, N.R.S. Chapter 104.200 et seq., and N.R.S. Chapter 104.900 et seq.), Uniform Commercial Code, and pursuant to the common law of England in force in Nevada] constitute a valid and enforceable transfer under Article 1, Section 10, of the United States Constitution, (commerce clause), and constitute a transfer which if not honored by state action will be a taking of property in violation of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ISSUES PRESENTED	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv, v
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION AND ISSUES PRESENTED	1
A. Jurisdiction	1
B. Issues Presented	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
A. Nature of Case and Prayer	3
B. Course of Proceedings ...	4
C. Statement of Case	6
ARGUMENT	15
PRAYER FOR RELIEF	20
APPENDICES	
A. Copy of Supreme Court Decision	
B. Copy of Denial of Rehearing	
C. Copy of Judge Foley Decision	
D. Fact Finding and Conclu- sions of Law	




TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	PAGE
E. Copy of the Front and Back of the Securities in Question	
F. Copy of Bank Contract	
G. Copy of In Re Secary, Penn. 1962	




TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	PAGE
United States Constitution,	
Article 1, Section 10,	
and the	
14th Amendment	2,19,20
<u>CASES CITED:</u>	
Berl v. Rosenberg , 336 P.2d 975	
(Cal. 1959)	18
Bridge v. Bridge , 11 Peters 420	
(1837)	20
Chadrow v. Kellman ,	
106 A.2d 594	
(Pa. 1954)	18
Dartmouth College v. Woodward	
17 U.S. 518,	
4 L.Ed. 629	20
Fletcher v. Peck , 6 Cranch 87	
(1810)	20





TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (Continued)

	PAGE
Hausfelder v. Security-First	
National Bank of	
Los Angeles, 176 P.2d 84	
(Cal. 1947)	18
In Re Sweeney's Estate,	
19 N.Y.S.2d 530	
(N.Y. 1940)	19
Kleeman v. Sheridan,	
256 P.2d 553	
(Ariz. 1953)	18
Ogden v. Saunders,	
12 Wheaton 213 (1827) ...	20
<u>STATUTES CITED:</u>	
N.R.S. 1.030	2
N.R.S. 104.200 <u>et seq.</u>	2
N.R.S. 104.900 <u>et seq.</u>	2
<u>RULES CITED:</u>	
Supreme Court Rule 17.1(c)	1



PETITION NO. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1989

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA


LORRAINE MALINAK,)
Petitioner,)
vs.)
EUGENE J. MALINAK,)
Respondent.)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

**STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION
AND
ISSUES PRESENTED**

A. Jurisdiction: Supreme Court
Rule 17.1(c).

When a state court of last resort
has decided an important question of
Federal Law which has not been but should



be settled by the Supreme Court of the United States, TO WIT:

B. Issues Presented

Negotiation under seal and delivery of negotiable stocks and bonds in the amount of approximately \$115,000.00 [pursuant to provisions of Articles 2 and 9 (N.R.S. Chapter 1.030, N.R.S. Chapter 104.200 et seq., and N.R.S. Chapter 104.900 et seq.), Uniform Commercial Code, and pursuant to the common law of England in force in Nevada] constitute a valid and enforceable transfer under Article 1, Section 10, of the United States Constitution, (commerce clause), and constitute a transfer which if not honored by state action will be a taking of property in violation of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.

1920. 1921. 1922. 1923. 1924. 1925. 1926. 1927. 1928. 1929. 1930.

1931. 1932. 1933. 1934. 1935. 1936. 1937. 1938. 1939. 1940.

1941. 1942. 1943. 1944. 1945. 1946. 1947. 1948. 1949. 1950.

1951. 1952. 1953. 1954. 1955. 1956. 1957. 1958. 1959. 1960.

1961. 1962. 1963. 1964. 1965. 1966. 1967. 1968. 1969. 1970.

1971. 1972. 1973. 1974. 1975. 1976. 1977. 1978. 1979. 1980.

1981. 1982. 1983. 1984. 1985. 1986. 1987. 1988. 1989. 1990.

1991. 1992. 1993. 1994. 1995. 1996. 1997. 1998. 1999. 2000.

2001. 2002. 2003. 2004. 2005. 2006. 2007. 2008. 2009. 2010.

2011. 2012. 2013. 2014. 2015. 2016. 2017. 2018. 2019. 2020.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Nature of Case and Prayer


This petitioner prays this Honorable Court for a Writ of Certiorari addressed to the Nevada Supreme Court and addressed to the Honorable Thomas A. Foley, District Judge, from an opinion by the Nevada Supreme Court filed April 25, 1989 (see appendix) and denial of motion for rehearing entered by Nevada Supreme Court on June 26, 1989, on appeal from a decision from the Honorable Thomas A. Foley, District Judge, entered March 30, 1988, which denied petitioner ownership of approximately \$115,000 of negotiable securities which had been duly negotiated and delivered to her by her mother, Mary H. Matelich (deceased) in 1977 approximately nine years prior to her death.

B. Course of Proceedings

The appeal upon which this petition is based arose in the context of a probate action commenced on April 25, 1986, when a petition for probate of will and for letters testamentary was filed in the lower court (ROA 1-16). Except for a few minor matters resolved on objections and orders, the administration of the estate appeared to be proceeding normally until the second amended inventory and record of value was filed on August 18, 1987 (ROA 74A-74E), indicating that the assets of the estate consisted only of a tax refund in the amount of \$2,822.00. The following day, a second report and account and petition for dismissal of estate was filed (ROA 61-66), indicating that the expenses of the estate had exceeded the assets received.

Respondent below Eugene Matelich objected to the second report (ROA 67-71), petitioner replied to the objection (ROA 72-74), and evidentiary hearings were held on the following issues: (a) whether or not the claim of petitioner, as surviving joint tenant to safe deposit box #354 at Nevada State Bank, entitles her to all the contents of said box; and (b) whether or not petitioner is the owner of the following assets found in an envelope left by the decedent in said safe deposit box: 1,750 shares of Pacific Power & Light Company; 500 Units of Nuveen Tax Exempt Bond Fund, Series 63, and 500 shares of Puget Sound Power & Light Company. (See ROA 344, lines 11-19; and ROA 99-294).¹

¹ Although the reporter's transcript of the November 12, 1987, hearing was designated (ROA 390, lines 16-17), it does not appear in the current index to



On March 30, 1988, the lower court issued its written Decision (ROA 344-350), finding against petitioner on both issues and directing respondents' lower attorneys to "prepare such Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order as they may deem appropriate." The same were prepared and eventually filed on May 4, 1988 (ROA-353-360), and petitioner herein timely noticed her appeal from same on May 10, 1988 (ROA 371-372).

C. Statement of Case

On April 3, 1986, petitioner's mother, Mary H. Matelich, died a resident of Clark County, leaving a will and codicil dated August 22, 1980 and February 6, 1981, respectively (ROA 353).

the record on appeal. Petitioner will endeavor to correct this through the lower court appeals clerk, or by motion if necessary. For the purposes of this Brief, however, petitioner will refer to the November transcript as "NTR."


The will, prepared and executed in Montana, provided that the decedent's identified household and personal effects, exclusive of investment securities, cash, bonds, and stock, would go to petitioner, while the "residue" of decedent's estate was to be placed in a trust, the income of which would go to the decedent's children (petitioner and Matelich respondent below), with the principal to be distributed to their lineal descendants only on the death of both petitioner and Matelich (respondent below). Additionally, the testamentary trust provided that the survivor of petitioner and Matelich (respondent below) would receive the other's share of the trust income for life. The codicil merely changed the decedent's choice of executor from her accountant, Wayne K. Knutson, to her daughter, the petitioner.



The following facts occurred during the decedent's lifetime, and relate to the extent of her ownership of and her intent regarding the assets at issue in this petition.

In February of 1971, the decedent and the petitioner opened a joint bank account, with approximately \$15,000 of the decedent's money and \$15,000 of petitioner's money (NTR 106-108), but in April of 1974 the account had to be liquidated in order to pay off a creditor of the decedent's husband and Matelich (respondent below) (NTR 110-111). Although petitioner was never reimbursed through cash for the money she had put into the joint account, the decedent endorsed certain stocks "over to her"²

² Rather than actually changing the name of the record owner through a transfer agent, it appears that the decedent merely "signed off" from the



[those identified in issue (b) above, hereinafter the EXCLUDED STOCK] in October of 1977, stating "you're now half-owner" (NTR 113-114; ROA 114-124).


In April of 1981, 8 months after the will was executed, the decedent moved to Las Vegas, where her daughter had been living since February of 1979, and indeed lived with her for a time (NTR 91, 58,

certificates so that they became "bearer paper," then wrote petitioner's Social Security number on each certificate (ROA 117-119, 135), presumably to limit their negotiability to petitioner. [The decedent wanted to have the stock re-issued, adding petitioner as a joint tenant, but petitioner said not to because she was going through a divorce at the time (ROA 121).] The parties stipulated to the authenticity of decedent's guaranteed signature on the certificates (ROA 104), but not to who wrote petitioner's Social Security number on them. The lower court received evidence from respondent below, Matelich's handwriting expert on this issue (ROA 232-275), but refused to continue the hearing to receive evidence from petitioner's handwriting expert (ROA 291-294).



65-66; ROA 115). In 1982, nearly two years after the decedent executed the will described above, she became increasingly concerned about her daughter working too hard, and repeatedly stated to others that she shouldn't and wouldn't have to worry about money, and that "everything I have is for my Laurie [Lori]" (see, for example, NTR 60-61, 66-68).

In the fall of 1982, apparently following up on this concern, the decedent had a friend take her to Nevada State Bank to open a safe deposit box "to make sure everything would be for her and Laurie [Lori]" (NTR 68-69). According to the friend, the decedent "said plainly that the box and its contents were for herself and her daughter, her daughter's future, period" (NTR 77-78) - "that Lorraine was going to be a partner on



everything, the box and everything in it"
(NTR 77).


Although the friend was not sure of the date (NTR 68), other facts of record indicate that she must have witnessed the decedent opening the first box (#1949) at Nevada State Bank, which was closed when she opened the joint tenancy box (#354) with petitioner on October 1, 1982.³ Moreover, petitioner

³ Among those facts of record are the following: on the day in question, the decedent seemed to know nothing about Nevada State Bank, whose name only came up because the decedent asked the friend where she banked (NTR 68); the decedent was not familiar with the area where the bank was located (NTR 82); the decedent never said anything to indicate that she already had a box there (NTR 83; ROA 154); the friend had to take the decedent to the bank because petitioner was working that day (NTR 83); the signature card (Exhibit E) the friend thought she saw the decedent sign looks identical to the signature card for the first box (Exhibit 1 below), with the exception of the date, a single X mark, and the absence of the signature of petitioner, whom the friend testified was not present



described in great detail the particulars of opening box #354 with her mother on October 1, 1982 (ROA 125 et seq.), including her mother asking for a joint tenancy account (ROA 132), reading the signature card [Exhibit E] (ROA 130), signing it (ROA 131), saying "This is your life" when she handed her the key

(NTR 87-88); on the day Exhibit E was signed by the decedent and petitioner, the friend was not present, it was petitioner's day off, and her mother had been telling her for approximately a month that she had an important paper for her to sign at the bank (ROA 126-127); without petitioner's signature, the first box, as an individual box, was ineffective for the decedent's stated purpose, whereas the second box, as a joint tenancy box, was consistent with that purpose; the first box was closed the day the second one was opened, which is also consistent with the decedent's stated purpose (see NTR 13 - although the dates thereat cannot possibly be correct - see NRT 18, 28 et seq.); finally, when petitioner and the decedent arrived at Nevada State Bank on October 1, 1982, she told her daughter "We have to go over here," indicating the safe deposit counter, in contrast to the time she went with her friend (ROA 127).



(ROA 131), watching her place in the box all of the envelopes of stocks and other financial instruments the two of them had sorted back in 1981 (ROA 133), including all of the stock and bond/unit certificates introduced in evidence, and concluding "Now everything is ours in joint tenancy" (ROA 134). Petitioner kept the key, but had no reason to enter the box until her mother died (ROA 135), and had previously promised her she would not touch the stock "signed over" to her in 1977 (ROA 116). Both petitioner and the decedent had prior experience with joint tenancy and knew what it meant in terms of ownership (NRT 96, 99-104, 106, 109-112; ROA 124, 132). Moreover, the customer service representative from the bank testified that the language on the signature card is read to the signatories at the time the box is opened (NRT 43).



The signature card (Exhibit E) for the box in question was consistent with this prior experience in providing as follows: **Joint Tenants** (1) The undersigned do hereby declare and represent that we own, as joint tenants, with rights of survivorship, all of the property of every kind or character at any time heretofore placed in said box and that all property which may be deposited therein by either of us, shall be and is owned by us as such joint tenants. (2) The right of access or control to said box shall not pass to the legal representatives of a deceased holder, but shall remain exclusively in the survivor or survivors. (3) Access to the box and its contents thereof may be by any one of the undersigned without the necessity of notifying or obtaining the consent of any other renter hereto upon




the bank obtaining the required signatures on the entrance record."

It is undisputed that all of the stocks, bonds, and other financial instruments that are the subject of this petition were found in the safe deposit box covered by the above-quoted agreement (ROA 114-116, 162), that the signatures on the agreement and the instruments are genuine (ROA 102-105, 212), and that the decedent was of sound mind at the time she went down to the bank to rent the box (NTR 85).

All other facts of relevance will be presented in the Argument section that follows.

ARGUMENT


If this Honorable Court holds that a joint tenancy was not created in the contents of the subject safe deposit box, then petitioner contends that the lower



court still erred in concluding that she was not entitled to keep the stock her mother gave her in 1977.


For, there was ample evidence before the lower court that the decedent opened a joint bank account with petitioner in 1971, with each of them contributing approximately \$15,000.⁴ There was also evidence that in April of 1974 the account had been liquidated in order to protect the decedent's home from one of her husband's and son's [respondent below Matelich's] creditors. There was also evidence that, instead of reimbursing petitioner for her share of

⁴ Although the decedent's accountant implied that all of the funds in that account came from the decedent's mother's estate, her mother's death certificate (Exhibit 22 lower) showed that she didn't die, and therefore had no estate from which the funds could have come, until 2 years later.



the money so used, the decedent endorsed the EXCLUDED STOCK with the intention of making a gift to petitioner, stating "you're now half-owner" (see footnote 2, *supra*). Finally, there was evidence that in 1981 these same stocks were placed in an envelope for identification purposes, and in 1982 that envelope was placed in the subject safe deposit box at the time petitioner received her key.

Given this evidence, Petitioner contends that the lower court's Findings of Fact #31 (no delivery or acceptance) and #33 (no consideration) were not supported by substantial evidence and should be set aside as clearly erroneous. For, as indicated in footnote 4, the only evidence "controverting" a consideration theory was itself shown to be impossible. But more importantly, either the signing of the signature card, or the delivery to



petitioner of the key to the box where the EXCLUDED STOCK was placed was legally sufficient to complete the intended inter vivos gift. See: **Chadrow**, 106 A.2d at 598; **Kleeman**, 256 P.2d at 555; and **Hausfelder**, 176 P.2d at 88.


Moreover, where, as here, the decedent expressed her "wish" that petitioner be "half-owner" of the EXCLUDED STOCKS, other courts have held such expressions to be a present transfer, sufficient to constitute a gift, even though the stocks were not formally transferred until a later date. See, for example, **Berl v. Rosenberg**, 336 P. 2d 975 (Cal. 1959) (decedent's letter stating that he "wished" to open a joint tenancy account with another was held sufficient to create the intended joint tenancy, even though the subject stocks were not formally transferred until after



the decedent's death).

At the very least, it would seem that petitioner should be entitled to a severable one-half-ownership of the EXCLUDED STOCKS, consistent with the plain meaning of the decedent's words at the time the transfer was first attempted. Petitioner only asks that this Honorable court review the evidence on this point, being mindful that delivery, acceptance, and consideration can occur in many ways, including through a key or the signing of a signature card, or through the payment of a debt of another. In some cases, a symbolic or constructive delivery is sufficient. See, for example, *In Re Sweeney's Estate*, 19 N.Y.S.2d 530, 531 (N.Y. 1940).


The decision below constitutes a taking by state action and judicial error in violation of the 14th Amendment to the



United States Constitution and a violation by the State of Nevada through indirect judicial legislation of Article 1, Section 10, of the United States Constitution, the contract laws. See: **Bridge 11 Peters 420; Dartmouth College 17 U.S. 518; Fletcher 6 Cranch 87; Ogden 12 Wheaton 213.**

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, This petitioner prays this Honorable Court for a Writ of Certiorari addressed to the Nevada Supreme Court and addressed to the Honorable Thomas A. Foley, District Judge, from an opinion by the Nevada Supreme Court filed April 25, 1989 (see appendix) and denial of motion for rehearing entered by Nevada Supreme Court on June 26, 1989, on appeal from a decision from the Honorable Thomas A. Foley, District Judge, entered March 30,



1988, which denied petitioner ownership of approximately \$115,000 of negotiable securities which had been duly negotiated and delivered to her by her mother, Mary H. Matelich (deceased) in 1977 approximately nine years prior to her death.

Respectfully submitted:

Lorraine Malinak
LORRAINE MALINAK
(PETITIONER IN PROPER PERSON)
3800 S. Decatur Blvd., Sp. 62
Las Vegas, Nevada 89103
Telephone: (702) 362-0164



APPENDIX A

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA

No. 19102

FILED

APR 25 1989

Clerk of Supreme Court

by /s/Jeanne C. Richards

Chief Deputy Clerk

IN THE MATTER OF THE ESTATE OF)
MARY H. MATELICH, Deceased, and)
LORRAINE MALINAK, Executrix,)
beneficiary and interested party,)
Appellant,)
vs.)
EUGENE MATELICH,)
Respondent.)

Appeal from a probate order. Eighth
Judicial District Court, Clark County;
Thomas A. Foley, Judge.



Affirmed.

Lynn R. Shoen, Las Vegas,

for Appellant,

Shaner & Trent, Las Vegas,

for Respondent.

O P I N I O N

PER CURIAM:

This opinion concerns the effect on the title of individually owned property when the owner places the property in a joint tenancy safe-deposit box and signs a signature card for the safe-deposit box declaring that all property placed in the box shall be joint tenancy property. We hold that the signature card does not create a joint tenancy in the property because the card is not a title-changing writing required by NRS 111.065(2) to create a joint tenancy. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order.




Facts

Mary Matelich and her daughter, Lorraine Malinak, opened a joint tenancy safe-deposit box into which Matelich deposited her stocks and bonds, totaling approximately \$600,000 in value. The card that they signed to open the safe-deposit box stated, in pertinent part, as follows:

Joint Tenants (1) The undersigned do hereby declare and represent that we own, as joint tenants, with the right of survivorship, all of the property of every kind or character at any time heretofore placed in said box and that all property which may be deposited therein by either or any of us, shall be and is owned by us as joint tenants. . . .

Matelich subsequently passed away, and Malinak claimed that the stocks and bonds became joint tenancy property when Matelich placed them in the safe-deposit box. Malinak argued before the district



court that the stocks and bonds should not be distributed according to the terms of Matelich's will because they became Malinak's by right of survivorship. The district court disagreed and included the stocks and bonds in the probate estate.

Discussion

The American Law Reports notes that the majority of states hold that property placed in a safe-deposit box becomes joint tenancy property if the signature card so provides. 14 A.L.R. 2d 948, 982. We, however, question the wisdom of this rule as did the author of the A.L.R. annotation:

[O]ne should be quick to add that this is hardly to be classed as a choice method of arranging title.

The reasoning applied in the cases denying that joint ownership can be created by agreement and deposit is entirely consonant with legal thinking. It is difficult to find in the deposit anything



closely approaching a traditional title-changing event. . . .

[W]ill intent (assuming intent plus deposit can change title), clearly expressed by the parties at the time of taking a safe-deposit box, that articles placed therein shall be jointly owned, prevail if it appears that a later deposit was meant to be temporary or that the depositor forgot the terms of the leasing agreement, or where an effect bears indicia of another kind of ownership?


Id., at 982-83..

Pennsylvania has rejected the majority rule that the signature card creates a joint tenancy in the contents of the safe-deposit box. *In re Estate of Secary*, 180 A.2d 572 (Pa. 1962). The facts of Secary are very similar to the facts of this case except that the holders of the safe-deposit box were brothers. The decedent had deposited stock certificates registered solely in his name in a safe-deposit box which the




brothers rented with a provision on the signature card that the contents would be joint tenancy property. The court held that the stock certificates remained the property of the decedent's estate alone because no valid inter vivos gift of a joint interest with right of survivorship had been made. *Id.*, at 575.

In favor of finding that the contents of the box in this case became joint tenancy property, Malinak cites to a Nevada case in which a signature card for a joint bank account created a joint tenancy with right of survivorship in the money deposited. Weinstein v. Sodaro, 91 Nev. 638, 541 P.2d 531 (1975). However, Weinstein is based on a statute governing the ownership of bank accounts. See NRS 100.085. There is no such statute for safe-deposit boxes, and we decline Malinak's invitation that we extend the



Weinstein holding to joint tenancy safe-deposit boxes.

The signature card that Matelich and Malinak signed was a declaration to the bank that they would deposit only joint tenancy property in the box. The bank apparently wishes to avoid the problems that might arise if one joint tenant of the safe-deposit box has access to the box while it contains the other joint tenant's individually owned property. While the declaration is an agreement between the bank and the renters of the box that the renters will put nothing but joint tenancy property in the box, the declaration is not sufficient to create a joint tenancy in the contents of the box because it is not an agreement between the renters and is not a title-changing instrument. The signature card does not, therefore, satisfy the requirement of NRS



111.065(2) that a joint tenancy be created by a writing.

The district court properly found that the stocks and bonds belonged to Matelich only and became part of her estate at her death. We have also considered Malinak's remaining assignments of error and have concluded that they are likewise without merit. Therefore, we affirm the district court's order.


/s/ Young , C.J.
Young

/s/ Steffen , J.
Steffen

/s/ Springer , J.
Springer

/s/ Mowbray , J.
Mowbray

/s/ Rose , J.
Rose



Attest: A full, true and Correct Copy.

Clerk of the Supreme Court

By /s/ Sharon E. Page Deputy



APPENDIX B

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA

No. 19102

FILED

JUN 26 1989

Clerk of Supreme Court

by /s/J.

Chief Deputy Clerk

IN THE MATTER OF THE ESTATE OF)
MARY H. MATELICH, Deceased, and)
LORRAINE MALINAK, Executrix,)
beneficiary and interested party,)
Appellant,)
vs.)
EUGENE MATELICH,)
Respondent.)

ORDER DENYING REHEARING

Rehearing denied. NRAP 40(c).



It is so ORDERED.

/s/ Young , C.J.
Young

/s/ Steffen , J.
Steffen

/s/ Springer , J.
Springer

/s/ Mowbray , J.
Mowbray

/s/ Rose , J.
Rose

cc: Hon. Thomas A. Foley, District Judge

Lynn R. Shoen

Shaner & Trent

Loretta Bowman, Clerk



APPENDIX C

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

FILED

MAR 30 11:42 AM '88

/s/ Loretta Bowman

CLERK


CASE NO. P 21248

DEPT. NO. XIII

In the Matter of the Estate of)
)
 MARY H. MATELICH)
)
 Deceased.)
)


D E C I S I O N

On March 7, 1988, at the hour of 10:30 A.M., this Court undertook the hearing on the issues framed, pursuant to the Order of Court submitted by DONALD R. DAVIDSON, III, Esquire, attorney-for Petitioner herein, said issues being specifically enumerated as follows: "(a)




whether or not the claim of LORRAINE MALINAK, as surviving joint tenant to safe deposit box #354 at Nevada State Bank, entitles her to all of the contents of said box; and (b) whether or not LORRAINE MALINAK is owner of the following assets found in an envelope left by the decedent in safe safe deposit box: 1,750 shares of Pacific Power & Light Company; 500 Units of Nuveen Tax Exempt Bond Fund, Series 63; and 500 shares of Puget Sound Power & Light Company."

The Court, since the hearing, has been concerned with the position taken by Petitioner that this Court can and should delve back into the evidentiary basis of a trial leading to the landmark decision in In Re Condos's Estate", 70 Nev 271, 266 P2d 404 (1954). Upon a very careful examination of Petitioner's Exhibit 13 in




evidence (by use of a magnifying glass), the Court is of the opinion that it matters not whether the Court can or should consider the exhibit procured from the trial of the aforementioned case in the Second Judicial District Court. What is of prime significance is that the signature cards in that case are not materially distinguishable from those in the instant case.

During the course of the trial, both in the Petitioner's case-in-chief, as well as Objector's case-in-chief, considerable evidentiary materials and testimony were adduced to establish handwriting, and indeed proposed Exhibits for Petitioner, 17, 18 and 19, are blow ups of portions of the handwriting in question and were prepared in advance of the evidentiary hearing on March 7th by either Petitioner's counsel or someone at




his direction. It is a fact that by way of discovery as early as October or November of last year, Petitioner knew of the existence of a handwriting expert by Objector. Petitioner was also aware that by discovery, Objector sought the name and address or the identity of Petitioner's prospective expert. It is further a fact that up to and including the end of Petitioner and Objector's case-in-chief, there was never any indication of the existence of a handwriting expert for and on behalf of Petitioner, notwithstanding that this case rested heavily on the question of who indeed was the person who executed certain legends to effect the transfer of stock the subject of issue (b) referred to hereinabove.

Suffice to state that upon the conclusion, the Petitioner having rested,




Objector having concluded his case-in-chief, for the first time Petitioner's expert, or the existence of such an expert, came to light, the Court did direct to Mr. DAVIDSON that he call his next witness, at which time Mr. DAVIDSON responded "I have a rebuttal witness who is not available. I would like to ask for a short continuance. The witness is a document examiner who lives in Los Angeles and he is out of the country. His name is William Bomantle (phonetic). He will be available next week, but he is out of the country." The Court inquired of Mr. DAVIDSON to learn that he had been advised of his missing witness "Last week", obviously sometime during the week of February 29th through March 4th. Objection was taken by Objector who pointed out that although there had been a free flow of information exchanged




between counsel, there had never been the answer to request for discovery as to experts by the Petitioner, and it was thereafter determined by questions of counsel and the Court that the expert was retained for his expertise as to the handwriting on the stock certificates concerning the social security number and that he had indeed been retained some time, according to Mr. DAVIDSON, in November or December of last year. It was, therefore, necessary under the attendant circumstances that the Court deny said motion for continuance to await the theretofore undisclosed expert "rebuttal witness".

On March 11, 1988, Petitioner filed in these proceedings an Application to Reconsider Oral Motion for Continuance or, in the Alternative, to Permit Re-Opening of Case or to Permit Testimony of




Expert Witness. Objections have been made and a Reply thereto. The Court heard arguments of Mr. DAVIDSON and PATRICIA TRENT this date and is constrained to deny Petitioner's Motion to Reconsider or in the Alternative to Re-Open.

This case has been fraught with unusual and near bizarre happenings and occurrences. This Court granted a Petition for the Probate of Will and Letters Testamentary on May 23, 1986, and set bond in the sum of \$400,000.00. This Order was prepared by DONALD R. DAVIDSON, III, on behalf of the Petitioner LORRAINE MARIE MALINAK, the Order Admitting Will to Probate and the Issuance of Letters Testamentary being executed by the undersigned Court on the 23rd day of May, 1986, and filed in these proceedings on the same date. Incident to these



proceedings, SHANER & TRENT, LTD., by and through PATRICIA A. TRENT, caused to be filed a Request for Special Notice on May 28, 1986. Letters Testamentary were not issued until the 9th day of July, 1986, the bond in the sum of \$400,000.00 being posted at that time. On September 30, 1986, an Inventory and Record of Value was filed in these proceedings, as prepared by Petitioner, and her oath, executed and sworn to by her attorney, DONALD R. DAVIDSON, III, as a Notary Public, as well as attorney, submitting said Inventory and Record of Value. This Record established the estate at a value of \$502,884.38, the substantial portions of said value being the stocks referred to hereinabove. On or about November 25, 1986, the Petitioner again, by and through her attorney, sought the sale of estate assets and for partial




distribution of income, giving notices of hearing and proofs of said notices. Again, said Petitioner, through her counsel, caused to be filed an Order Approving Payment of Creditor's Claims and permitting the sale of an estate asset. Thereafter, on May 27th, there was an Amended Inventory and Record of Value filed, setting forth the amount and value of \$502,264.58. The First Report and Account and Petition for Partial Distribution of Estate and Allowance of Executrix's Commissions and Attorney's Fees, consisting of 12 pages, was filed March 27, 1987, notice of hearing on said Report being duly and regularly given, to which an Objection was filed on April 14, 1987, said Objection being brought by the Objector herein, EUGENE MATELICH, the son of the decedent, whereupon as of May 13, 1987, on application of Objector's



counsel, Judge LEAVITT, on this Court's behalf, did enter an Order authorizing John Keckler, a questioned documents examiner, to examine the envelope in which the several stock certificates were discovered and upon which the purported handwriting of the decedent was alleged to have been found. On June 1, 1987, the Probate Court issued its Order approving the First Report and Account and Petition and for Allowance of Executrix's Commissions and Attorney's Fees. Thereafter, the Petitioner sought a substitution of Executor of the estate, wherein and whereby Nevada State Bank consented to be appointed or substituted as Executor in lieu of Petitioner herein, LORRAINE MARIE MALINAK.

All of said proceedings were prepared by DONALD R. DAVIDSON, III, Esquire. On July 22nd, Objection to the



Petition for Substitution was filed and said substitution was denied pursuant to Order on July 29, 1987. On August 19, 1987, the Petitioner herein, as Executrix, caused to be filed herein a Second Report and Account and Petition for Dismissal of the Estate and a Second Amended Inventory and Record of Value, showing the estate to have the paltry value of \$2,822.00, contending that all of the other assets of said estate belonged to the Petitioner herein. It was this action that precipitated the Objection to the Second Report and Account. EUGENE MATELICH, the Objector herein, set forth that by virtue of the law as acknowledged in In Re Condos's Estate, supra, an Executrix attempting to claim most all of the assets of the estate is inappropriate as a matter of law.

Mr. DAVIDSON knew as of September 15, 1987, that based upon the Order that he prepared for my signature, setting forth the issues to be heard upon an evidentiary hearing, the requisite need of handwriting expertise.

It is the considered opinion of this Court, taking into consideration all of the records and files, briefs, exhibits, oral testimony and arguments of counsel heretofore presented in this proceeding as to the claim of LORRAINE MARIE MALINAK, contending that she is the surviving joint tenant of the safe deposit box #354 at Nevada State Bank, entitling her to all of the contents thereof, cannot stand and must be dismissed hence. Further, it is the opinion of this Court that the estate is the owner of all of the assets referred to in issue (b) heretofore set forth and

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

the claim of LORRAINE MARIE MALINAK to
the contrary notwithstanding.

Our Supreme Court in In Re Estate of
Condos, supra, succinctly stated:

The bonds at the time of
decedent's death were in
a bank safe-deposit box
held by the parties under
joint tenancy agreement
with the bank. That
agreement in effect
provided that each party
individually, without
notice to or consent of
the other, had rights of
access to the box, of its
surrender and to remove
its contents. By the
overwhelming weight of
authority such an
agreement, required by
the bank as a matter of
practice for its own
protection, cannot in and
of itself constitute a
creation of a joint
tenancy in the contents
of the box.


Any differences in the signature
cards in the Condos matter and that of
the instant proceedings are of no moment
and do not in any way vary the above and

foregoing determination of this Court. Hence, the Court is not required to search further for authority for or against going beyond the written decision of our Supreme Court to determine whether the Court can or should consider such evidence adduced at the trial level of such case. In Re Condos's Estate remains the substantial authority for which it has been recognized to these many years.

SHANER & TRENT are directed to prepare such Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order as they may deem appropriate.

DATED: This 30th day of March,
1988.

/s/ Thomas A. Foley
THOMAS A. FOLEY
DISTRICT JUDGE



APPENDIX D

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

FILED

MAY 4 3:52 PM '88

/s/ Loretta Bowman

CLERK

CASE NO. P 21248

DEPT. NO. XIII

DOCKET G


In the Matter of the Estate of)
MARY H. MATELICH, Deceased.)

)

FINDINGS OF FACT,

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER


The continuation of the above-entitled case having come on regularly for hearing before the Court commencing on March 7, 1988; DONALD R. DAVIDSON, III, ESQ. appearing on behalf of the Petitioner, LORRAINE M. MALINAK, and



JEFFREY IAN SHANER, ESQ. and PATRICIA A. TRENT, ESQ. appearing for the Objector, EUGENE J. MATELICH, and the Court having read and considered all of the records and files, briefs, exhibits, oral testimony and arguments of counsel, the Court finds the following facts and states the following conclusions of law:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. MARY H. MATELICH died a resident of Clark County, Nevada on April 3, 1986.
2. MARY H. MATELICH, (hereinafter referred to as "DECEDENT"), executed a will and codicil dated August 22, 1980 and February 6, 1981, respectively, which provided for the bulk of her estate, (consisting mainly of stocks and bonds titled in her sole name), to be distributed to a trust for the benefit of her children, LORRAINE MARIE MALINAK, (hereinafter referred to as "MALINAK"),




and EUGENE J. MATELICH, (hereinafter referred to as "MATELICH"), as well as two family groups consisting of each of their offspring.

3. MALINAK was appointed as Executrix of DECEDENT'S estate on May 23, 1986 and on July 9, 1986, Letters Testamentary issued to her after the posting of a \$400,000.00 bond.

4. MALINAK caused to be filed an Inventory and Record of Value on September 30, 1986, establishing the estate at a value of \$502,884.38; on March 27, 1987, the Inventory and Record of Value was amended by MALINAK to reflect a value of \$502,264.58.


5. A portion of the stocks and bonds which were titled solely in the DECEDENT'S name were not included in the estate total referenced on either the Inventory and Record of Value or the



Amended Inventory and Record of Value, those stocks and bonds being more particularly described as follows: 1750 shares of Pacific Power and Light Company, 500 Units of Nuveen Tax Exempt Bond Fund, Series 63, and 500 shares of Puget Sound Power and Light Company, (hereinafter referred to as "EXCLUDED STOCK").

6. On March 27, 1987, MALINAK caused to be filed the First Report and Account and Petition for Partial Distribution of Estate and Allowance of Executrix's Commissions and Attorney's Fees to which an Objection was raised on April 14, 1987 by MATELICH, who sought to obtain information concerning MALINAK'S justification for omitting the EXCLUDED STOCKS from the estate inventory.

7. On June 1, 1987, an Order Approving First Report and Account and



Petition and for Allowance of Executrix's Commissions and Attorney's Fees was approved; the remaining portion of said petition with respect to distribution was held in abeyance until a ruling was entered on the objection filed by MATELICH.

8. On July 9, 1987, MALINAK petitioned for a substitution of Nevada State Bank in her place to which MATELICH filed his opposition on July 22, 1987. This petition was denied by Order dated July 29, 1987.

9. On August 19, 1987, MALINAK caused to be filed a Second Report and Account and Petition for Dismissal of Estate and a Second Amended Inventory and Record of Value showing the estate value of \$2,822.00, contending that all other assets of the estate belonged to her.

10. MATELICH filed his objection to

1900-1901. Do you know of any other 1900-1901

the Second Report and Account which resulted in a hearing conducted on November 12, 1987.

11. All the verified pleadings filed during this administration were executed by MALINAK under oath.

12. All pleadings were prepared and submitted by DONALD DAVIDSON as attorney for MALINAK.

13. MALINAK understood the import and content of each verified pleading.

14. MALINAK'S execution of verified pleadings purporting to administer all of the stocks and bonds as part of the estate inventory was inconsistent with her later claim to sole ownership over said assets.

15. The assets of the estate consist in large part of stock and bond certificates discovered in Nevada State Bank safe deposit box number 354 after

DECEDENT'S death.

16. The DECEDENT first opened a safe deposit box with Nevada State Bank, number 1949 on August 20, 1982 which was closed on August 23, 1982; a second safe deposit box was opened by DECEDENT with Nevada State Bank, number 354, on October 1, 1982.

17. The signature appearing on the assignment section of each EXCLUDED STOCK certificate was endorsed by DECEDENT on October 18, 1977.

18. When DECEDENT executed the assignment section of each EXCLUDED STOCK certificate, she did so in order to liquidate the same and utilize the proceeds therefrom to pay anticipated debts.

19. DECEDENT did not execute the assignment section of each EXCLUDED STOCK certificate with intent to transfer any

interest therein to MALINAK.

20. As of the date of DECEDENT'S death, the assignment section appearing on each of the EXCLUDED STOCK certificates was incomplete.

21. The handwritten Social Security number identified as MALINAK'S appearing on each of the assignment sections of the EXCLUDED STOCK certificates was written by MALINAK and not by the DECEDENT.

22. MALINAK acted without court approval in presenting her Letters Testamentary to transfer agents in accomplishing a change of ownership from that of DECEDENT to MALINAK on a portion of the EXCLUDED STOCK, to-wit: the Pacific Power and Light Company stock and the Nuveen Tax Exempt Bond Fund.

23. MALINAK, without court approval, withdraw from the estate account and deposited to her own account

the amount the estate realized from the company's redemption of a portion of the EXCLUDED STOCK, to-wit: the Puget Sound Power and Light Company stock.

24. The Nevada State Bank signature card bearing signatures of the DECEDENT and MALINAK contained language which purported to create a joint tenancy interest in the contents of the box.

25. Nevada State Bank representatives do not, as a matter of practice, explain to customers that they may contract with their bank for the designation of title on a safe deposit box as anything other than as a sole or joint owner, despite the fact that there is available a deputy designation which is designed for the purpose of allowing someone other than a sole owner to gain access to the contents of the safe deposit box.

9/11 1962. Back to the office and to work with
Bill. The meeting is to discuss the new
branch report and to discuss the new plan.

10/1 1962. Back to the office and to work
with Bill. The meeting is to discuss the new
branch report and to discuss the new plan.
Bill is to go to the office and to discuss
the new plan with the branch manager and
the branch manager is to discuss the new
plan with the branch manager.

10/2 1962. Back to the office and to work
with Bill. The meeting is to discuss the new
branch report and to discuss the new plan.
Bill is to go to the office and to discuss
the new plan with the branch manager and
the branch manager is to discuss the new
plan with the branch manager.

10/3 1962. Back to the office and to work
with Bill. The meeting is to discuss the new
branch report and to discuss the new plan.
Bill is to go to the office and to discuss
the new plan with the branch manager and
the branch manager is to discuss the new
plan with the branch manager.

26. Nevada State Bank representatives do not explain any legal ramifications of the signature card which they ask their customers to sign when contracting with their bank for the security of a safe deposit box.

27. Nevada State Bank requires its customers to sign an agreement on a signature card which the bank, as a matter of practice, uses for its own protection.

28. From the date that the safe deposit box contract was signed on October 1, 1982 until the date of the DECEDENT'S death on April 3, 1986, no one but the decedent entered or gained access to safe deposit box number 354.

29. The DECEDENT held within her possession and control all of the stocks and bonds titled solely in her name including the EXCLUDED STOCK until the

date of her death.

30. The DECEDENT was the sole recipient of all dividend income from all of her stock and bond holdings including income on all of the EXCLUDED STOCK.

31. There was no delivery of any of DECEDENT'S stocks or bonds by the DECEDENT and there was no acceptance of any of DECEDENT'S stocks or bonds by MALINAK.

32. MALINAK and the DECEDENT shared no agreement, written or otherwise, for the joint acquisition of stocks and bonds.

33. MALINAK gave DECEDENT no money or other valuable consideration for the purchase of any interest in the stocks and bonds owned by the DECEDENT.

34. MALINAK, by and through her counsel, retained the services of an expert handwriting witness in November or

December of 1987.

35. Discovery was premised upon open and full disclosure of the names of witnesses and any reports those witnesses may have prepared.

36. MATELICH disclosed the identity of his witnesses and provided MALINAK'S counsel with his expert's report prior to trial.

37. MALINAK failed to disclose the existence or identity of the expert witness until a motion was made at the end of MATELICH'S case-in-chief.

38. MALINAK, by and through her attorney, represented that she was prepared to proceed when the continuation of her case-in-chief resumed on March 7, 1988.

39. MALINAK, by and through her attorney, knew one week prior to the March 7, 1988 hearing that the expert

1981 by redacted

witness she had previously engaged could not be available on the date of the hearing.

40. MALINAK was not prepared to offer testimony from her expert rebuttal witness because he was not available.

41. MALINAK failed to submit a written motion for a continuance with supporting affidavits in compliance with the requirements outlined in the Eighth Judicial District Court Rules.

42. MATELICH engaged the services of an attorney whose fees approximated \$20,000.00 and MATELICH may ultimately expend a total of \$35,000.00 including his out-of-pocket expenses.

43. The services of an attorney were necessary to protect the interests of the estate and trust beneficiaries.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Court has jurisdiction over

the settlement of the instant estate pursuant to NRS 136.010.

2. The bank agreement executed between the DECEDENT and MALINAK did not alter existing ownership rights in the property discovered in safe deposit box number 354.

3. The EXCLUDED STOCK are assets of the estate.

4. There was no consideration given by MALINAK for the acquisition of any interest in DECEDENT'S stocks and bonds.

5. MALINAK did not receive any of DECEDENT'S stocks and bonds as a gift during DECEDENT'S lifetime.

6. MALINAK'S motion for a continuance was properly denied.

7. The services of MATELICH'S attorney benefitted the estate and the trust beneficiaries.

8. MATELICH is entitled to reimbursement of attorneys' fees and costs.

ORDER

THEREFORE, by virtue of the law and by reason of the premises aforesaid, it is ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED:

The claim of LORRAINE MARIE MALINAK contending her right to take full possession of the contents of safe deposit box number 354 is hereby dismissed; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the EXCLUDED STOCK should be included as assets of DECEDENT'S estate; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that MALINAK'S application to Reconsider Oral Motion or Continuance is denied; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that MATELICH is entitled to attorneys' fees and costs of suit in the sum of \$10,000.00 on account.

JUDGMENT RENDERED: May 04 1988

THOMAS A. FOLEY
DISTRICT JUDGE

SUBMITTED BY:

SHANER & TRENT, LTD.

/s/ Patricia A. Trent

PATRICIA A. TRENT, ESQ.
715 South Sixth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorney for MATELICH

APPENDIX E

NEVADA STATE BANK

OFFICE WSO #3 BOX NO. 354

NAME MATELICH, MARY H. or LORRAINE
MALINAK

DATE OF THIS CARD 10/1/82


JOINT TENANTS

INDIVIDUAL TENANT

The undersigned hereby rent the safe deposit box identified hereon upon the following terms and conditions:

Joint Tenants (1) The undersigned do hereby declare and represent that we own, as joint tenants, with the right of survivorship, all of the property of every kind or character at any time heretofore placed in said box and that all property which may be deposited therein by either or any of us, shall be and is owned by us as such joint tenants.

(2) The right of access or control to



said box shall not pass to the legal representatives of a deceased holder, but shall remain exclusively in the survivor or survivors. (3) Access to the box and the contents thereof may be by any one of the undersigned without the necessity of notifying or obtaining the consent of any other renter hereto upon the bank obtaining the required signatures on the entrance record.

Individual and Joint Tenants (1) The liability of the bank is expressly limited to the exercise of ordinary diligence to prevent the opening of the box during the rental term herein or any extension or renewal thereof, by any person other than renter(s) or his/their duly authorized representative, and such opening shall not be inferable from the loss of any of its contents; not shall the bank be liable for permitting a

deputy of fiduciary agent authorized by any one of the undersigned to have access to and remove the contents of said box after the death or disability of any one of the renters and before the bank has knowledge of such death or disability.

(2) The undersigned does/do hereby acknowledge receipt of two keys to the box and further acknowledges that a receipt for the payment of the rental for said box was delivered to him/us this date, upon which is printed the terms and conditions of use now in force, which by this reference is incorporated herein as if set forth in full.

SIGNATURE REQUIREMENTS OF JOINT TENANTS

one

SIG (1) /s/ Mary H. Matelich

NAME - MARY H. MATELICH

SIG (2) /s/ Lorraine M. Malinak

NAME LORRAINE MALINAK

SIG (3) _____

NAME _____

SD-0105 R 8/77

[handwritten] 030-14-03

S/D SIG CARD--PERSONAL

YANKEE DODGER - 1960

1970

1980

1990 - 2000

2000 - 2010

2010 - 2020

APPENDIX F

407 Pa. 162

In re ESTATE of Arthur SECARY, Late of
Conemaugh Township, Somerset County,
Pennsylvania, Deceased.

Appeal of Lewis D. SECARY.

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

April 17, 1962.

Rehearing Denied May 16, 1962.

Action presenting question as to whether decedent's brother was entitled to contents of a safe deposit box under written lease of such box. From a final decree of the Orphans' Court, No. 330, 1958, Thomas F. Lansberry, J., the brother appealed. The Supreme Court, No. 147, March Term, 1962, Bell, C. J., held that although decedent and his brother were lessees of a safety deposit box as joint tenants, there was no delivery of

contents of box by decedent to brother sufficient to establish an inter vivos gift of the contents, none of which had ever been individual property of the brother, who entered the box only twice and then only after decedent's death and with widow of decedent, who was the only person who had entered the box before his death.

Decree affirmed.

1. **Executors and Administrators --**

221(4) Gifts -- 49(1)

Claims against a dead man's estate, including a claim of a gift inter vivos, can be established only by evidence which is clear, direct, precise and convincing.

2. **Gifts -- 22**

Although decedent and his brother were lessees of safety deposit box as joint tenants, there was no delivery of contents of box by decedent to brother

sufficient to establish an inter vivos gift of contents, none of which had ever been individual property of brother, who entered box only twice and then only after decedent's death and with widow of decedent, who was only person who had entered box before his death.

3. Gifts -- 15, 18(2)

To constitute a valid gift inter vivos of contents of a safe deposit box, there must be an intention to make an immediate gift and such an actual or constructive delivery to donee as to divest owner of all dominion and control, or if a joint tenancy is created, as to invest in donee so much dominion and control of subject matter of gift as is consonant with a joint ownership or interest therein.

Nathaniel A. Barbera, Shaver &

Barbera, Somerset, for appellant.

Frank A. Orban, Jr., Somerset, Wayne G. Wolfe, Spencer, Custer, Saylor & Wolfe, Johnstown, for appellee.


Before BELL, C. J., and MUSMANNO, JONES, COHEN, EAGEN, and O'BRIEN, JJ.

BELL, Chief Justice.

The question involved is narrow. Was decedent's brother entitled to the contents of a safe deposit box under the written lease thereof?


Arthur Secary died intestate on December 23, 1958, at the age of 49. He was survived, *inter alia*, by his widow, Kay G. Secary, and his mother, Mabel Sicheri, also known as Mabel Secary, as his sole heirs at law, and a brother, Lewis D. Secary, who is the present appellant.

On December 31, 1958, letters of



administration were issued to his widow, Kay G. Secary. Included in the inventory and appraisement were certain contents of safe deposit box number 541B in the Moxham National Bank of Johnstown. These consisted of \$109,240 in cash, an agreement of lease dated October 1, 1945, between Bird Coal Company and decedent and an extension of this lease, and 24 shares of the American Telephone & Telegraph Company dated May 12, 1958, in the name of Arthur Secary. The box also contained 12 Certificates of Indebtedness of North Fork Country Club in the amount of \$25. each, and 7 U.S. War Savings Bonds totaling \$375 in face value which were in the names of Arthur Secary or Mary Secary;¹ these were not listed in the inventory.

1. Decedent's first wife. This marriage ended in divorce in 1954, three months before decedent married Kay G. Secary.



The inventory and appraisement also included (a) a checking account in the Moxham National Bank of Johnstown in the name of Kelso Coal Company in the amount of \$12,745, and (b) cash contained in envelopes and located in decedent's home in the amount of \$8,905.

Appellant, Lewis D. Secary, filed several objections to the inventory and appraisement, but only two are pressed on this appeal, namely, the ownership of the contents of the safe deposit box and the North Fork Country Club certificates, all of which the Orphans' Court held belonged to Arthur Secary's estate.

[1] We start with the well settled principle that claims against a dead man's estate, including a claim of a gift *inter vivos*, can be established only by evidence which is clear, direct, precise and convincing. *Petro v. Secary Estate*,

and the following day the author was invited to speak at a meeting of the
Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in the city of New Haven,
Connecticut, and to receive the degree of Doctor of Law. The author
then returned to New Haven and remained there for a week.

On the 10th of June, 1887, the author was invited to speak at a meeting of the
Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in the city of New Haven,
Connecticut, and to receive the degree of Doctor of Law. The author
then returned to New Haven and remained there for a week.

On the 10th of June, 1887, the author was invited to speak at a meeting of the
Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in the city of New Haven,
Connecticut, and to receive the degree of Doctor of Law. The author
then returned to New Haven and remained there for a week.

On the 10th of June, 1887, the author was invited to speak at a meeting of the
Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in the city of New Haven,
Connecticut, and to receive the degree of Doctor of Law. The author
then returned to New Haven and remained there for a week.

On the 10th of June, 1887, the author was invited to speak at a meeting of the
Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in the city of New Haven,
Connecticut, and to receive the degree of Doctor of Law. The author
then returned to New Haven and remained there for a week.

On the 10th of June, 1887, the author was invited to speak at a meeting of the
Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in the city of New Haven,
Connecticut, and to receive the degree of Doctor of Law. The author
then returned to New Haven and remained there for a week.

On the 10th of June, 1887, the author was invited to speak at a meeting of the
Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in the city of New Haven,
Connecticut, and to receive the degree of Doctor of Law. The author
then returned to New Haven and remained there for a week.

403 Pa. 540, 543, 170 A. 2d 325.

Appellant contents that he has met the burden of proof by presentation in evidence of the lease of safe deposit box number 541B which was executed by both Appellant and decedent. Appellant contends that this lease created a valid *inter vivos* gift of a joint interest with right of survivorship in all the contents of the box, and that the gift thus created was corroborated by oral testimony.

[2] The lease pertinently provides:

"Lessor and lessees covenant and agree to and with each other that said box and said space is leased subject to the following terms, conditions, agreement, rules and regulations: * *.

"J. C. In case the
Lessees are joint tenants,
including husband and wife, it
is hereby declared that all
property of every kind at any
time heretofore or hereafter


2. Italics throughout, ours.

placed in said box is the joint property of both Lessees and, upon the death of either, passes to the survivor subject to inheritance tax laws. Each of the Lessees shall have full access to and the control of the contents of said box without further authority. The Lessor shall not be liable, in the event that property belonging to the joint tenants having access to said box be misappropriated by one or more of those having access. Each or all of the Lessees may appoint a deputy to have access to or surrender the box. * * *

"Lessees hereby acknowledge the receipt of two keys to said box and space".

Appellant bases his claim on King Estate, 387 Pa. 119, 126 A.2d 463. In that case the lease was identically the same as the lease in the instant case, but the Court held that in the light of the oral evidence the contents of the box belonged to the surviving tenant.

The law on the subject of joint accounts was in a state of confusion due




(a) to the fact that the alleged gifts were often evidenced or created by differently worded signature cards or other written instruments or by oral evidence; (b) the fact that in many instances the written instruments (which were executed had been prepared by a bank to cover nearly every conceivable transaction) contained such broad or general language as to be equivocal or ambiguous; (c) the failure to distinguish between an ordinary gift and the gift of a joint interest; (d) practical considerations, especially with respect to the delivery of the contents of a singly or jointly owned safe deposit box; and (e) the uncertainty as to whether the transaction constituted a gift causa mortis, an inter vivos gift, or a contract.

In an attempt to clear up the

confusion³ we stated and established the principles of law which are applicable in an alleged gift of a jointly owned safe deposit box or the contents thereof (pages 122-124, 126 A.2d page 465-466):

[3] "To constitute a valid gift inter vivos of the contents of a safe deposit box, two essential elements are requisite: An intention to make an immediate gift, and such an actual or constructive delivery to the donee (a) as to divest the donor of all dominion and control, or (b) if a joint tenancy is created, as to invest in the donee so much dominion and control of the subject matter of the gift as is consonant with a joint ownership or interest therein. The burden of proof is upon the claimant to prove the gift by clear and convincing evidence. Tomayko v. Carson, 368 Pa. 379, 83 A.2d 907. Where an owner of a safe deposit box and his donee execute a contract or lease which recites that the property therein is the joint property of the lessees, with

3. The confusion is analyzed and reviewed in the majority and dissenting opinions in Chadrow v. Kellman, 378 Pa. 237, 106 A.2d 594.



right of survivorship, and that the lessees acknowledge the receipt of two keys to said box--this creates a *prima facie* case of a valid *inter vivos* gift of a joint interest (with right of survivorship) in said property. The majority view appears to be that parol evidence is admissible (a) to prove an intention, or lack of intention, to make a gift as well as (b) delivery or failure of delivery, because the instrument is considered to be incomplete or (sometimes) equivocal. Cf. *Furjanick's Estate*,⁴ 375 Pa. 484, 100 A.2d 85. However, it is established that the parol evidence which is necessary to disprove such gift must be clear, precise and * * * [convincing]. Cf. *Furjanick's Estate*, 375 Pa. 484, 100 A.2d, 85, *supra*; *In re Fell's Estate*, 369 Pa. 597, 87 A.2d 310, *supra*; *Mader v. Stemler*, 319 Pa. 374, 179 A. 719, *supra*; *Dempsey v. First National Bank of Scranton*, 359 Pa. 177, 58 A.2d, 14, *supra*.

* * * [S]uch a contract creates a *prima facie* valid *inter vivos* gift of a joint interest (with right of survivorship) in all the property in said box, and the

4. Footnote omitted.



burden of proof shifts to the parties contesting the gift to prove a want of intention or a failure of delivery. This burden they have failed to sustain."


The Court then analyzed the oral evidence and found that it supported the contract and a completed *inter vivos* gift to the donee because, *inter alia*, (1) when King changed his safe deposit contract with the bank from his name to that of himself and his wife, he told the bank custodian he did not want his wife merely to have access, he wanted a joint contract, (2) King and his wife each possessed a key to the box, and (3) King and his wife had each separately exercised their respective right of access to the box, and consequently King's executrix failed to sustain her burden of proof, viz., to prove a want of intention by King or a failure of delivery. The Court then distinguished



Chadrow v. Keilman, 378 Pa. 237, 106 A.2d 594, for the reason that in that case the Court held there had been no valid inter vivos gift because "it is conceded that decedent alone received and kept both keys to the box and that claimant never had possession of either key and never had access to the box * * * since claimant never had access to the safe deposit box, the donor did not divest himself of dominion over the property claimed * * *."

These facts point up the distinction between King Estate and the instant case. In the instant case the uncontradicted evidence shows that decedent entered safe deposit box number 541B on 33 separate occasions between May 26, 1950,⁵ and


5. The safe deposit box was originally leased on December 20, 1948. No evidence appears in the record to indicate how many times or who gained



December 23, 1958 (the date of his death), while on the other hand Appellant entered the box only twice--both occasions being after Arthur Secary's death and in the company of Arthur's widow. Furthermore, both keys to the box were kept in decedent's home and on the two occasions when Appellant entered the box, decedent's widow produced the key because Appellant did not have a key in his possession.

It is important to further note that the stock, the coal company lease, the country club certificates and the War Savings bonds were all in the name of the decedent (or his former wife) and claimant never asserted that these or the cash which was found in the box had ever been his individual property.

access to the box between December 20, 1948, and May 26, 1950.



In the light of this clear, uncontradicted and convincing evidence we conclude that Arthur Secary's estate sustained its burden of showing a failure of delivery of the box and its contents to Appellant. *Chadrow v. Kellman*, 378 Pa. 237, 106 A.2d 594. Cf. *King Estate*, 387 Pa. 119, 126 A.2d 463, *supra*; *Grossman Estate*, 386 Pa. 647, 126 A.2d 468.

Decree affirmed, costs to be paid by Appellant.